

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/584,780	09/28/2007	Jeremy Stephen Matcham	17638-008US1 INTEU/P31704	7827
	26161 7590 12/30/2011 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. (BO)		EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022		HAN, KWANG S		
MINNEAPOLIS, MIN 55440-1022		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1727		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/30/2011	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

1	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/584,780	MATCHAM ET AL.			
Examiner		Art Unit			
	Kwang Han	1727			

	Kwang Han	1727				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
HE REPLY FILED 14 December 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
. Me The reply was flied after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of thi application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire stort than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set fort in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office latter than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL						
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)),	o avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since				
AMENDMENTS						
<ul> <li>3.  \( \) The proposed amendment(s) flied after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because         <ul> <li>(a) \( \) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(b) \( \) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> </ul> </li> </ul>						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.  NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.39(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).						
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>						
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is for will be) a follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:	Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-4 and 7-16.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 13(d)(1).						
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see continuation.						
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:						
/Barbara L. Gilliam/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1727						
Supervisory ratelit Examiner, Art Offit 1727	1					

The arguments and amendments regarding the withdrawn claims will not be considered because it is a new issue which requires further consideration.

Applicant argues the prior art of Nonobe does not disclose or suggest the "calibration function" recited within claim 1, in which a minimum liquid water flow rate is expressed as a function of current and/or air stolchiometry, where the minimum liquid water flow rate is based on a corresponding maximum voltage, and a delivered minimum liquid water flow rate is determined by the calibration function.

In response to Applicant's arguments please consider the following: The method of Nonobe discloses the measurement of the outputted current from the fuel cell with its repective resistance to execute the humidification condition determining routine based on these measured values (8:44-57; 9:43-51; 10:47-52) thereby being a function of the current as required by the limitations of the claim. Nonobe further teaching the routine being started when the measured current being equal to the predetermined current (Iset) provides a set point for operation which functions based on the measured current.